



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

unintentional or conscious and deliberate⁷⁷. But Art copies Nature, and the tricks of rhetoric certainly rest on some psychological foundation.

On page 148 he says:

My contention, then, is that verbal iterations occurring in first-class literature, when not due to self-quotation of an obviously intentional kind, should be regarded as subconscious.

Leo would probably have called this subconscious repetition *adnominatio* (see above, page 147).

Professor Cook's theory that "word-persistence" is the foundation-stone of iteration is interesting, but he hardly makes it convincing to me. Indeed, I cannot help feeling that this question must always remain a matter of opinion with the reading public, and that, to arrive at an absolutely final conclusion, it would be necessary to ask each separate poet whether he repeats words purely to secure emphasis and rhetorical effect, or because a word he has just used persists in his memory until he employs it a second or a third time. I agree entirely with Professor Cook that, in a large number of cases, words are repeated unconsciously because of their persistence in the memory. A large majority of such cases, however, would be classed by most readers as examples of inartistic or careless repetition. Professor Cook is more charitable. But, when a poet deliberately sets himself to the creation of an effect, of whatever kind, by repetition, it seems unnatural to argue that each succeeding iteration is first present subconsciously in his mind, and is then seized on and weighed in the artistic balance before being employed in the verse. The repetition which appears to be unconscious or subconscious usually occurs—if my observation is correct—after the intervention of one or more lines; and, as suggested above, it is hardly to be distinguished from careless and inartistic iteration. Four examples follow.

Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.1, 5:

At regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura

verbaque, nec placidam membris dat cura quietem.

4.13, 15, 22:

Degeneres animos timor arguit. Heu quibus ille

Si mihi non animo fixum immotumque sederet,

solus hic inflexit sensus, animumque labantem.

Statius, *Silvae* 1.6.76, 81:

immensae volucrum per astra nubes,

tollunt innumeras ad astra voces.

Juvenal 10.98, 101-102:

ut rebus laetus par sit mensura malorum?

et de mensura ius dicere, vasa minora
frangere⁷⁸.

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE, HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT.
Wake Forest, North Carolina.

⁷⁷Professor Cook, on page 265, states that he regards as unconscious the verbal echoes which Mezger and Bury have made so important in their structural study of Pindar.

⁷⁸For other examples, see footnote 76.

REVIEWS

The Greek Genius and Its Influence: Select Essays and Extracts. Edited by Lane Cooper. New Haven: Yale University Press (1917). Pp. xii+306. \$3.50.

Professor Lane Cooper's interest in the Classics and his championship of them, especially of Greek, must be known to every reader of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. Mention may be made here of his Phi Beta Kappa address, entitled *Ancient and Modern Letters*, of which a partial summary was given in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.73-74. In 8.178-182 appeared his admirable paper, *The Teaching of English and the Study of the Classics*, which was reprinted and circulated extensively, as a separate pamphlet, by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. In 11.49-52 appeared his paper, *English Translations of Greek and Latin Classics*, in which he gave an account of a course he has conducted for more than a decade at Cornell University, as part of the work there of the Department of English Literature. It was this course Professor Cooper had in mind when he wrote as follows in the Preface (vii) to the book under review:

This volume appears in response to the needs of one of my classes, and is meant to supply a part of the necessary background for the study of Greek and Latin masterpieces in standard English translations, and to stimulate and rectify the comparison of ancient with modern literature.

The contents of the book are as follows:

Introduction: The Significance of the Classics, Lane Cooper (1-22); I. Shelley¹, from *Hellas* (23-24); II. John Clarke Stobart², *The Legacy of Greece* (25-33); III. Francis G. and Anne C. E. Allinson³, *External Nature in Greek Poetry* (34-46); IV. Milton⁴, from *Paradise Regained* (47-48); V. John Henry Newman⁵, *Attica and Athens* (49-62); VI. Sir Richard Jebb, *The Age of Pericles* (63-76); VII. Arthur Elam Haigh⁷, *The Attic Audience* (77-84); VIII. Maurice Croiset⁸, *The Greek Race and Its Genius* (85-97); IX. August Boeckh⁹, *The Nature of Antiquity* (98-131); X. Abby Leach¹⁰, *Fate and Free Will in Greek Literature* (132-155); XI. Marjorie L. Barstow¹¹, *Oedipus Rex: a Typical Greek Tragedy* (156-162); XII. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf¹², *The Character and Extent of Greek Literature* (163-167); XIII. Gilbert Murray¹³, *The 'Tradition' of Greek*

¹Four short extracts, from the Preface to *Hellas*; the Prologue to *Hellas*, 31-43; *Hellas* 682-687, 692-703, *Hellas* 992-1007.

²From the *Glory that was Greece*, 1-11. ³From *Greek Lands and Letters*, 12-31 (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.147-148). ⁴4.237-280.

⁵From Newman's *Historical Sketches*, 18-23, 33-46.

⁶A lecture delivered by Jebb, at Glasgow, in 1889, published from his manuscript, after his death, in Jebb, *Essays and Addresses*, 104-126 (Cambridge, 1907).

⁷From the *Attic Theatre*, 275-276, 323-325, 343-348. Haigh's footnotes "have been omitted as of no immediate value here".

⁸A translation, by Professor Cooper, of A. and M. Croiset, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, 1.1-19.

⁹A translation, by Professor Cooper, of Boeckh, *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der Philologischen Wissenschaften*, 263-300.

¹⁰A modification, with Miss Leach's permission, of her paper, *Patalism of the Greeks*, *American Journal of Philology*, 36.373-401.

¹¹A slight modification of a paper originally published in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.2-4.

¹²A translation, by Professor Cooper, from *Die Griechische und Lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, 1-4 (in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil I, Abteilung VIII).

¹³From the *Yale Review* 2.215-233.

Literature (168-182); XIV. Edward Kennard Rand¹⁴, *The Classics in European Education* (183-198); XV. Charles Grosvenor Osgood¹⁵, *Milton's Use of Classical Mythology* (199-217); XVI. Samuel Lee Wolff¹⁶, *The Greek Gift to Civilization* (218-225); XVII. Thaddeus Zielinski¹⁷, *Our Debt to Antiquity* (226-242); XVIII. Basil L. Gidersleeve¹⁸, *Americanism and Hellenism* (243-260); XIX. Ernest Renan¹⁹, *Paganism* (261-268); XX. Gilbert K. Chesterton²⁰, *Paganism and Mr. Lowes Dickinson* (269-277); XXI. Browning, from *Old Pictures in Florence*²¹ (278-280); *Bibliography* (281-286); *Index of Proper Names* (287-306).

As already indicated by the quotation given above from the Preface, Professor Cooper prepared this volume with definite reference to the needs of his class, in which the masterpieces of Greek and Latin literature and the principles of their composition are studied in translations. The following further quotation from the Preface (viii) will help to make clear the ideas that lay in his mind during the preparation of this book:

. . . The most important of all the selections, the keystone of my arch, is my translation from Boeckh's *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der Philologischen Wissenschaften*. No apology need be made for the length of this extract from a book of extraordinary significance in modern classical scholarship, but one that is sadly neglected by our day and generation. The selection may not offer easy reading, for Boeckh makes heavy demands upon the translator, yet to the judicious student it will serve as a touchstone for the worth of other characterizations of antiquity. . . .

As for the order, an attempt has been made, where possible, to let one selection lead up to another, sometimes by a more superficial, sometimes by a deeper, association of ideas. In general, the sequence is this. We pass from the external environment of the Greeks to a characterization of the race, and of Athens at the zenith of its power. Then come three intermediate selections (from Professor von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Professor Murray, and Professor Rand), representing the links between the ancient and the modern world. And finally, beginning with Dr. Osgood's remarks on Milton's use of classical mythology, we have a series of essays and extracts more directly concerned with modern times and the surviving element of antiquity. It will be found, however, that virtually every writer here included has dwelt with some force upon the relation of Greece to the modern era or our own day. An occasional reference to Rome and Latin literature, as intermediary between Hellenism and modern times, could not be avoided—nor has there been any desire to avoid it, in the Bibliography or elsewhere. Even so, the title of the book does not improperly indicate the contents.

¹⁴This paper may be found in *The School Review* 18.441-459, and in F. W. Kelsey's *Latin and Greek in American Education*, 260-282 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.98).

¹⁵From Osgood, *The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems* x-xxii. This dissertation is No. VIII of *Yale Studies in English*.

¹⁶The major part of an article which appeared in *The Nation* (New York), April 7, 1910, as a review of J. P. Mahaffy, *What Have the Greeks Done for Modern Civilization?* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.220-221).

¹⁷From Zielinski, *Our Debt to Antiquity*, 1-29 (translation by H. A. Strong and H. Stewart).

¹⁸From *Hellas and Hesperia, or The Vitality of Greek Studies in America*, 87-130 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.65-66).

¹⁹A translation by Professor Cooper, of Renan, *Nouvelles Études d'Histoire Religieuse*, 14-30 (a review of Alfred Maury's *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce Antique*, 1).

²⁰From Chesterton, *Heretics*, 153-170.

²¹Stanzas 11-20.

In the Introduction (2) Professor Cooper defines a 'dead language' as

one that some persons are too indolent to learn—or, when they attempt to learn it, they find their spirits running bankrupt. . . . Lacking some measure of vitality or sensitiveness, they desire, as they say, to study the things of the present.

But what is the present? For the individual, says Professor Cooper, it is "so much of human experience as he may at any moment revive within himself". The present is thus (2)

either a line without breadth, or it is a tract as extensive and as full of life and meaning as the insight of the student can make it. The only real limit is the measure of his sympathy. He fills the present with life and meaning by a study of the past.

For the ends of a preliminary education, our author continues, some periods have shown a more abundant life than others. Since no one could examine all the records of the past, or even all the main records of the past, there is need of selecting parts or periods of civilization for intensive study as especially deserving it. Believing that it is (3)

the function of humane study to provide mankind with a self-perpetuating and ever more exalted ideal, of human life, and thus to make life more and more abundant,

Professor Cooper selects as the century that first demands the attention of serious students the century embracing the life of Christ and the lives of his immediate followers; of that period the New Testament is the chief document. Next in importance, Professor Cooper sets the thirteenth century, the age of Dante. As third in order of importance he sets the representative age of classic literature, the hundred years or so from Pericles to Alexander (3-4).

Turning now to essay his portrayal of the Greek spirit, Professor Cooper begins as follows (6):

The Greeks were the most versatile and evenly developed race that Nature has yet brought forth, our American stock not excepted. They had seemingly the most diverse powers, both intellectual and artistic, which were held in equipoise by a most unusual capacity for checking wayward impulse. . . . the fundamental Hellenic traits are neither many nor one, but three: direct vision, a high degree of sensitiveness, and an extraordinary power of inhibition. Homer and Sophocles saw clearly, felt keenly, and refrained from much. Their power of inhibition enabled the Greeks to look long and steadily at every object, great and small, from the structural features of the landscape, the mountains and the clouds, to man both as an individual and in combination with others of his kind, and from man to the wasp and the frog and the meanest flower that blows; and their sensitiveness made the impression distinct and permanent. As a result, they learned to see parts as parts, and the relation between them, and wholes as wholes, with the relation between part and whole. This accounts for their discovery of order and organization in the world about them—in what they termed the cosmos; it accounts also (if genius can be explained) for their own constructiveness—for the perfection of their architecture, and for the architectonic qualities of their prose and poetry. What they conceived was distinct and orderly, like

the cosmos itself; hence what they executed, whether temple or epic poem, had the finished structure of a living organism: every detail was subordinate to the functions of the whole. Thus the deed of horror, the slaying of Aegisthus at the hand of Orestes, was subordinate to the total effect of the tragic story; the frieze of the horsemen was contributory to the general but distinct effect of the Parthenon; and the worth of the individual was measured by his service to the State. But the State itself was a being, so to speak, like an animal of a higher sort, whose function was to live the life of reason, contemplating and realizing justice and truth, which were divine. Wherever they looked, these sensitive men saw life, divine, distinct, and orderly.

Naturally, in view of what has just been said, Professor Cooper finds that the Greeks were religious (7-9). In the intellectual sphere, they made fine, yet clear and true distinctions, between ideas, and between objects in the world about them; all this has led (9) to their superiority in the mental, moral, and political sciences.

It cannot be gainsaid that in the one article of disciplining the human body, and perfecting the human form, they set a standard which no nation since, nor any part of it, has equaled, or is likely soon to equal. The indubitable sign of this excellence is their sculpture.

On pages 10-11 Professor Cooper expresses the view that modern scientists—ornithologists, entomologists, zoologists, psychologists—may learn much from the Greeks, particularly Aristotle. From the latter, aside from important facts, we moderns may learn the habit of exact personal observation, the method of research, and

a sense of the relation of every part of science to the whole, and a recognition of the fact that, while any science may at any time be subservient to any other, even the higher to the lower, still some sciences in the long run are subordinate. A knowledge of the habits of birds and fishes, for example, is less important than a knowledge of the characteristic actions of men.

This brings Professor Cooper (11) to the last trait of the Greeks that needs remark, their scientific interest in human conduct, which, with their profound belief in a First Cause, determined their attitude to human life(11):

With their habitual thoroughness, then, the Greeks observed and classified the various types of men, and the ways in which men act, individually as well as in combination, and in the different periods of life. The powers of men, resulting in right action and happiness, they called virtues, and the characteristic lapses from the normal, resulting in imperfect action and absurdity or ruin, they called vices. They thus built up, as we find in the *Ethics*, *Rhetoric*, and *Politics*, of Aristotle, and in the *Characters* of Theophrastus, a thorough-going science of the types and ages of men, of their virtues and vices, and of the several species of organization that arise when families combine to form states. They described youth, or the magnanimous man, or the coward, or a democracy, with the same precision we use, and they too used, in describing the natural history and physiology of a plant. The thing is

defined, and its mode of action explained. So in the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle analyzes the qualities of youth, old age, and middle life, because the public orator will have men of each sort in his audience, and must know what kind of argument will gain or lose their votes. So in the *Ethics*, with scientific objectivity, he represents the man of perfect virtue, the norm or standard by which other men are to be judged. So in the *Characters*, Theophrastus exhibits the nature and activity of The Flatterer, The Surly Man, The Boor, and so on, some thirty types in all, who depart from the standard set in the *Ethics*, treating them as dispassionately as if they were flowers. From what I can learn, there has been no comparable body of systematic knowledge produced upon this subject since the Middle Ages, and none on any part of it that is not copied either from Greece, or, if to some extent original, inferior to the work of Aristotle and Theophrastus as a guide to the individual in studying himself, or to the leader in studying his fellows.

Professor Cooper proceeds next (12-19) to give in translation a few passages of Greek literature which, in his judgment, serve to illustrate at least a part of what has been said in his Introduction, because they represent, either directly or by contrast, the Greek ideal of humanity—that human ideal which, in spite of its limitations, still makes the Classics worth our study. Finally (19), he glances at the relation which the study of the Classics bears to the interpretation of modern literature. He thinks that the simplest way to obtain a glimpse of this important topic is to read a few lines from

a modern poet who, in the directness of his vision, in his sensitiveness, and in the quality of self-restraint, is very close to the Greek spirit. But the lines of Wordsworth's *Character of the Happy Warrior* have another quality in addition, and betray a gentleness of heart which is not ancient, but modern.

In this volume, plainly, Professor Cooper has put together a large body of material which will be of service not only to the immediate audience he had in mind, but to those who can read and interpret the Greek masterpieces for themselves in the original. It is a pity that the Yale University Press felt it necessary to attach so high a price to the book. I fear that books at \$3.50 per volume are not likely to help the Classics very extensively. C. K.

A CORRECTION

In my notice of Professor Greene's book, *Hints and Helps for Students of Latin* (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 12.105), I wrote as follows: "Some, if not most, of the examples through the book, are made up by the author, often enough, to be sure, on the basis of actual Latin passages". Professor Greene is afraid that this remark may make on some people an unfortunate impression. He writes: "The fact is, that with the exception of a few brief examples, such as those in Sec. 35, a and 50, a, the sentences are from Latin writers verbatim et literatim, mostly from Cicero and Caesar. I omitted references for fear that students who prefer to 'ride' would waste time hunting out the translations in their trots". C. K.